Case 1:13-cr-00626-RMB Document 3 Filed 10/03/13 Page 1 of 7

D93zolmc Conference 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, New York, N.Y. 13 CR 626 (RMB) 4 V. 5 ANTONIO OLMEDA, 6 Defendant. ----x 7 8 September 3, 2013 9 12:40 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. RICHARD M. BERMAN, 12 District Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 BY: MICHAEL MAIMIN 17 JOHN CRONAN Assistant United States Attorneys 18 NANCY ENNIS 19 Attorney for Defendant 20 21 22 23 24 25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please rise.

THE COURT: How are you? Please be seated.

So this is our first conference. Has there been an arraignment already in this case?

MR. MAIMIN: Yes, your Honor. Last week Mr. Olmeda was arraigned by Magistrate Judge Francis and entered a plea of not guilty to all six counts.

THE COURT: Okay. So where do you think things are going here in terms of scheduling and next steps, et cetera?

MR. MAIMIN: Well, Judge, I've been speaking with defense counsel about that. We are -- I was hoping to hand her a CD of discovery right here, but I had some technical problems, so we're making that available within the next few hours. I've told defense counsel that we will supplement within one to two weeks because we're just obtaining some additional documents from the state to turn over. And then after that I think it's a question of what, if any, pretrial motions there will be.

Ms. Ennis has predicted that there's a decent chance this will go to trial, and there will be some fairly weighty issues regarding in limine motions that I've already started discussing with Ms. Ennis. And so I think that this may be the odd case where we'll need a little bit less time for pretrial motions than usual, because I don't see any big ones coming up -- I could be wrong, obviously -- but more time than usual

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on the in limine motions to make sure that those are fully briefed, and, to the extent a hearing is necessary, any hearing is had on those.

> THE COURT: Great.

MR. MAIMIN: Additionally, Mr. Olmeda is facing charges out in Queens on state charges. Right now he is in the middle of a suppression motion out there, and he's due back there on October 2nd.

THE COURT: So how does that case impact this one in terms of trial schedule, et cetera?

MR. MAIMIN: Because he's in the middle of a suppression motion, and my understanding from the D.A. is that motion has been delayed largely by repeated changes of counsel, I don't believe that a trial schedule has been set, and that's pending resolution of the motion.

THE COURT: I see. Okav.

So, Ms. Ennis, what's your view?

MS. ENNIS: Yes. I conferred with Mr. Maimin this morning, your Honor, and he indicated that he believes he'll finish discovery in this matter in approximately two weeks. I suggested to him that defense motions, which I believe might be necessary given possible issues regarding the charges in Oueens --

> THE COURT: Sure.

MS. ENNIS: -- overlapping with this, that I would

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

like four weeks for defense motions. And, therefore, we suggested a date in late October or early November for motions, for defense motions. THE COURT: Well, why don't we maybe -- do you want to

have a conference in between or no?

MS. ENNIS: That's certainly -- that's fine.

THE COURT: And then we could see where you are vis-a-vis the discovery. Why don't I give you a conference in say 30 days. Does that work?

MS. ENNIS: Yes. That works for us.

THE COURT: Then you can tell me --

MS. ENNIS: Sure.

THE COURT: -- exactly what motions you're planning and when.

MR. MAIMIN: Right now I think if we're going to do it in 30 days, I was just conferring with Mr. Cronan, we should make sure that he's available on the date, because normally at least one of us can make it, but I have a trial beginning September 30th. So I want to make sure he's available on that date.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll suggest a date, then you'll tell me if it works.

> Thank you. MS. ENNIS:

THE COURT: Counsel and Ms. Ennis, is October 3rd a good date for you?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ENNIS: I believe he's going to Queens on October 2nd to resume that suppression hearing, so there might be a conflict there. Perhaps the following week would be good if we could work something out.

THE COURT: How about Wednesday, the 9th of October, at 2:00 p.m?

MS. ENNIS: That's fine with the defense, your Honor.

MR. MAIMIN: That's fine for the government, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Ennis, we'll just mark it as a status conference right now, and then you'll tell me on that date what, if any, motions, and maybe we'll talk in advance and figure out a schedule that's mutually satisfactory.

MS. ENNIS: Yes. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: So is Mr. Olmeda currently held in state custody or what's his status?

MR. MAIMIN: He's presently here on a writ. spoken to the Marshals, as well as to Queens D.A., and I think right now it looks like the preference of the various holding authorities is that he remain -- although he's technically in state custody because of the writ, that he remain in the temporary custody of the Marshals and he'll be writted to state court as necessary.

> THE COURT: For his suppression hearing or whatever.

MR. MAIMIN: That's right. But he's being held

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

without bail there.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MAIMIN: And, accordingly, Ms. Ennis did not seek bail here, reserving her rights, of course, should the subject of bail arise.

THE COURT: So do we have an application or need for one for speedy trial exclusion to October 9, 2013?

MR. MAIMIN: Yes, your Honor. The adjournment here is done in order to allow Ms. Ennis and her client to look over discovery and also, as I understand from Ms. Ennis, to consider what I think she's hoping may be fruitful purely legal motions dealing with the confluence of this case versus the case over there. So in order to allow for the defense to review discovery, consider and begin preparing motions, as well as preparing for the significant possibility of a trial, the government believes that the adjournment here is -- that the interests of justice in granting the adjournment here outweigh the interests of the defendant and the public in a speedy trial and, therefore, move for an exclusion of time pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to find under 18 United States Code, Section 3161, that the request for adjournment joined in by both sides is appropriate and warrants exclusion of the adjourned time from speedy trial calculations.

I further find that the exclusion is designed to

prevent any possible miscarriage of justice, to facilitate these proceedings, including possible motion practice and discovery, and to quarantee effective representation of and preparation by counsel for both parties. And thus the need for exclusion and the ends of justice outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3161(h)(7)(a) and (b).

So unless there is anything further, I'll see you all on October 9, 2013 at 2:00 p.m.

> MR. MAIMIN: Your Honor, may I have one moment? Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

Thank you, your Honor. MS. ENNIS:

THE COURT: Nice to see you all.

MR. MAIMIN: Good to see you too, Judge.

(Adjourned to October 9, 2013 at 2:00 p.m.)

24

25